

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are currently pending. Claims 26-31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 1, 6-10, and 15-19 have been amended by the present response. The amendments to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 10, and 15-19 are rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of patented application, U.S. Patent No. 7,603,335; Claims 1, 10, 15-19, and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,117,253 to Nakayama et al. (hereinafter, “Nakayama”), U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0163033 to Wolfe et al. (hereinafter, “Wolfe”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0019497 to Volk et al. (hereinafter, “Volk”); Claims 2-5 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama, Wolfe, Volk, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077984 to Ireton (hereinafter, “Ireton”); Claims 6-9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama, Wolfe, Volk, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054650 to Chun (hereinafter, “Chun”); and Claims 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama, Wolfe, Volk, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0093790 to Logan et al. (hereinafter, “Logan”).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the interview granted to Applicants’ representatives on July 14, 2010, at which time the outstanding rejections of the independent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) were discussed, as substantially summarized hereinafter. At

the end of the discussion, the Examiner suggesting making the following changes to expedite a potential allowance of the present case:

(a) Incorporating the features of Claims 26-31 into the corresponding independent claims,

(b) Moving the features recited in the preambles of Claims 10, 16, and 18 into the respective bodies of the claims,

(c) Filing a Terminal Disclaimer, and

(d) Replacing the term “if” recited in the claims with the term “with.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner during the above-mentioned interview, thereby placing the present application in condition for allowance.

Regarding the obviousness-type double patenting rejections of Claims 1, 10, and 15-19, a Terminal Disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent No. 7,603,335 is being filed herewith. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the obviousness-type double patenting rejections of Claims 1, 10, and 15-19 have been overcome.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections, as discussed during the interview, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, including Volk, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the (1) transmitting file request information that requests an acquisition/use file including an attributes information providing address, separate from the contents providing address, or the (2) transmitting attributes request information for requesting contents attributes information for altering the attributes of the contents data corresponding to the in-storage contents identification information to the attributes information providing address in the acquisition/use file, as recited in Claim 1.

Please note that the discussion regarding Claim 1 also applies to independent Claims 10 and 15-19 because these claims recite features that are analogous to features recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent Claims 1, 10, and 15-19 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of dependent Claims 2-9, 11-14, and 20-25, it is respectfully submitted that the additionally cited references do *not* remedy the deficiencies of Nakayama, Volk, and Wolfe discussed above. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of dependent Claims 2-9, 11-14, and 20-25 be withdrawn.

Finally, as discussed during the interview, the claims have been amended to recite the terms “whether” or “when” instead of the term “if” to better conform with U.S. patent practice.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Pranay K. Pattani
Registration No. 66,587
Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866